

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the thorough examination of the present application, and respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow. Claims 1-26 have been rejected. By way of this Amendment and Reply, claims 1, 2, 3, 5, 7-11, 15, 16, 19, 21, 22, and 25 have been amended. No new matter is added by way of these amendments, and support for the amendments may be found throughout the specification as originally filed. Upon entry of the above amendments, claims 1-26 will remain pending in the present application.

I. Claims Objections

The Office Action objects to claims 15-20 because the preamble is allegedly “confusing.” Although Applicant does not agree with this assessment, in the interest of advancing prosecution, Applicant has amended independent claims 15 and 16 to recite “A control program embodied on a non-transitory memory that when executed causes a device to perform” Because this language is substantially similar to the language suggested by the Examiner, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection.

II. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action rejects claims 1-5, 7-11, 13-19 and 21-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,362,742 to Siddiqi *et al.* (“Siddiqi”) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0012202 to Fukutomi (“Fukutomi”). Additionally, the Office Action rejects claims 6, 12, 20, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Siddiqi in view of Fukutomi and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0060576 to Kime *et al.* (“Kime”). Applicant traverses these rejections for at least the reasons set forth below.

With regard to independent claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 15, 16, 21, and 22, the Office Action asserts that Siddiqi discloses all of the previously pending claim elements except for “an address of

which a transfer destination is a port bound to a wireless interface from said packet transfer information.” See Office Action at 8. The Office Action, however, asserts that Fukutomi discloses this claim element absent from Siddiqi, and that it would have been obvious at the time of invention to combine the two teachings. See *id.* While Applicant believes this assertion to be unreasonable (see arguments submitted in the Amendment and Reply filed on May 17, 2010), in the interest of compact prosecution, Applicant has further amended independent claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 15, 16, 21, and 22 to more particularly describe aspects of the present application. As discussed in detail below, Siddiqi and Fukutomi, whether considered alone or in combination, cannot be reasonably interpreted as disclosing the claim elements recited in amended independent claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 15, 16, 21, and 22.

Siddiqi discloses a method for sending updates from an “authoritative access point” (AAP) to other AAPs, wherein the updates are related to other functioning access points (AP). In particular, a copy of the AAP’s “local subnet mapping table” is sent from a first AAP to other AAPs. (See, e.g., Abstract, col. 4, lines 52-64, and col. 5, lines 7-19). Thus, Siddiqi generally relates to a method of updating AAPs via distribution of local subnet mapping tables. (See, e.g., Abstract, col. 4, lines 52-64, and col. 5, lines 7-19).

Fukutomi, on the other hand, discloses “a network interconnection method by a combination of tag-VLAN and multicast delivery.” (Fukutomi at para. [0001].) More precisely and with respect to unicast forwarding, Fukutomi recites that a unicast forwarding “table consists of destination IP addresses indicating destination receiver hosts, subnet masks, the output ports of the LAN interface 11a to which the subordinate routers reaching the receiver hosts are connected, and output VLAN’s indicating the identification numbers of VLAN’s to which packets having the respective destination IP addresses belong.” (Fukutomi at para. [0034].) Accordingly, Fukutomi generally discloses a table that includes the destination IP address and the output port of the LAN interface. (See, e.g., Fukutomi at para. [0034].)

Neither reference, however, discloses or even suggests storing “a managed terminal list having addresses of terminals registered, said terminals being targets of management,” as recited in amended independent claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 15, 16, 21, and 22. (Emphasis supplied.)

In addition, neither reference discloses or suggests “receiving packet transfer information from an access point; detecting a port bound to a wireless interface from said packet transfer information, said wireless interface being the port of the access point, [and] extracting an address of a transfer destination corresponding to said detected port,” as recited in amended independent claim 15 and similar recited in amended claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 16, 21, and 22. (Emphasis supplied.)

Moreover, neither reference discloses or suggests “estimating that a terminal corresponding to an address registered in said managed terminal list, said address coinciding with said extracted address, exists as a subordinate of the access point retaining said received packet transfer information,” as recited in amended independent claims 1, 7, 15, and 21. (Emphasis supplied.)

Furthermore, neither reference discloses or suggests “investigating an operation situation of a terminal corresponding to an address registered in said managed list, said list address coinciding with said extracted address, to determine that said terminal having said extracted address has a connection with the access point retaining said received packet transfer information in a case where said terminal having said address is in operation,” as recited in amended independent claims 2, 8, 16, and 22. (Emphasis supplied.)

Stated more broadly, the present application is distinguishable from Siddiqi and Fukutomi inasmuch as the present application utilizes available transfer information that the access point retains. This transfer information includes information of a correspondence between the port and the interface, as well as information of a correspondence between the address of the transfer destination and the port. In a case where the port of the access point is a wireless interface, the address of the transfer destination is extracted from the above-mentioned transfer information. Given that the addresses of the terminals to be managed are stored by the management apparatus, an estimation or determination can be made as to which access point has the terminal as a subordinate of the access point from the address of the terminal to be managed and the extracted

address. Because these concepts and in particular the above-mentioned claim elements are not disclosed in Siddiqi and Fukutomi, Applicant respectfully submits that a rejection based thereon cannot be reasonable maintained.

With regard to the remaining Kime reference, Applicant notes that this reference was relied upon in the Office Action merely as alleged evidence of one or more elements recited in dependent claims 6, 12, 20, and 26 of the present application. This reference, however, does not disclose the above-discussed claim elements absent from Siddiqi and Fukutomi, nor has the Office Action asserted that it does. Therefore, the rejection of claims 6, 12, 20, and 26 should be withdrawn for at least the same reasons as discussed with respect to amended independent claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 15, 16, 21, and 22.

CONCLUSION

Because none of the references cited in the Office Action, either separately or in combination with each other, teaches or suggests all of the features recited in independent claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 15, 16, 21, and 22, Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 15, 16, 21, and 22 are patentable over these cited references. Furthermore, because dependent claims 3-6, 9-14, 17-20, and 23-26 are each directly or indirectly dependent upon independent claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 15, 16, 21, and 22, Applicant submits that each of these claims are allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above, in addition to other reasons which Applicant reserves the right to argue at a later time if necessary.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by the credit card payment instructions in EFS-Web being incorrect or absent, resulting in a rejected or

incorrect credit card transaction, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 10/20/2012

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 945-6014
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

By 

George C. Beck
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 38,072